

**-- REMARKS --**

**Specification.** The Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct typographical errors detected in the specification. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of the specification herein.

**Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 14.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Dinh rejected pending claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 14 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.112:

**A.** Examiner Dinh rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite

The Applicant amended claim 5 herein to depend from claim 3 to obviate this indefinite rejection of claims 5-7. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite is therefore respectfully requested.

**B.** Examiner Dinh rejected claims 1, 2 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,496,939 to *Moberg*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Dinh's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1, 2 and 14 over *Moberg*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Moberg*. To warrant this anticipation rejection of claims 1, 2, and 14, *Moberg* must show each and every limitation of independent claims 1 and 14 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 1 and 14. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully asserts that *Moberg* fails to show "wherein said LED control switch (24) is further operable to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED light source (10) as a function of the LED current relative to a peak threshold" in as complete detail as is contained in amended

independent claim 1, and “clamping a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED light source (10) as a function of the LED current relative to a peak threshold” in as complete detail as is contained in amended independent claim 14.

Specifically, as shown in FIG. 1, *Moberg* discloses a transformer 12, a transistor 18 and an oscillation & clamp control circuit 22 that operate to clamp a peak of a LED current as a function of feedback voltage to circuit 22 via secondary winding 16 reaching a level where a base current of transistor 18 is insufficient to maintain the transistor in the conducting state. See, Moberg at column 3, line 29 to column 4, line 12. Clearly, *Moberg* fails to teach or suggest a clamping of the peak of the LED current as a function of the LED current relative to a peak threshold.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Moberg* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 2 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Moberg* for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Moberg*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Moberg* is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claims 3 and 8.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Dinh objected to pending claims 3 and 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Applicant has rewritten claim 3 in independent form including “a power converter (23) operable to provide a regulated power including a LED current and a LED voltage”, and “a LED control switch (24) operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light source (10)” as recited in independent claim 1 and has rewritten claim 8 in independent form including “a power converter (23) operable to provide a regulated power including a LED current and a LED voltage” as recited in independent claim 1. The Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3 and 8 as amended herein are allowable over the art of record, particularly *Moberg*, and therefore request an allowance of claims 3-13.

January 15, 2007  
Case No.: US020601 (7790/115)  
Serial No.: 10/539,981  
Filed: June 19, 2005  
Page 10 of 10

**SUMMARY**

Examiner Dinh's rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 14 have been obviated by the amendments herein of claims 1, 2, 5 and 14. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Dinh is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: January 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,  
*AJAY TRIPATHI, et al.*

---

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Robert J. Kraus  
Registration No. 26,358  
Attorney for Applicant

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

---

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

Frank C. Nicholas  
Registration No. 33,983  
Attorney for Applicant